

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The drawings have been amended at Fig. 7 to correct a double reference character, namely changing "56" to --57--. The Examiner's approval of the enclosed drawing correction is respectfully requested. The specification has been amended at page 3, line 6, to conform with the noted drawing correction and eliminate the double reference character. These corrections are responsive to the Examiner's comments in the Office Action, page 2, clause 1, which are noted with appreciation.

Claims 1-3, 5 stand canceled.

The remaining claims have been amended responsive to the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection in the Office Action, page 2, clause 3. Antecedent basis is provided for the carbon granules, the axial direction, the lateral direction, the support frame, and the seal.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Goto et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication NO. US 2001/0032545. Amended claim 4 requires that the border member (34) have a first section (42) extending along the height direction (38) and providing the support frame and the seal, and has a second section (44) extending laterally outwardly from the first section (42) in L-shape cross-section along all four of the noted defined ends, namely the first and second axial ends (20 and 22) and the first and second lateral ends (26 and 28), and that the second section (44) be resiliently compressible along the height direction (38) for gasket sealing, and that both of the first and second sections (42 and 44) be composed of urethane, and that the noted L-shape have a first leg providing the noted first section (42) and have a second leg providing the noted second section (44). Neither Goto et al. '545 nor the cited Japanese Patent Document 63-287521 show or suggest the defined structural combination including the defined L-shape cross-section including the defined second leg section (44) extending laterally outwardly from the first leg section (42) along all four of the defined ends (20, 22, 26, 28). This is significant for both the noted support frame and the noted seal and to retain the carbon granules between the first and second backing layers (14, 16) and prevent escape of the noted carbon granules out of the

ends, including all four ends (20, 22, 26, 28). Consideration and allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 defines a combination including a mold top (72) and a mold base (50) having the defined trough (62) holding urethane therein. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Japan '521. In response, it is respectfully noted that there is no disclosure of the defined trough in Japan '521. Consideration and allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Japan '521. Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore claim 7 has been amended to require that the one or more injection ports (86, 88) extend transversely to the defined height direction (38) and communicate with the trough (62) for injecting urethane thereinto. This is not shown in Japan '521. Furthermore, in Goto et al. '545, injection port 8, Fig. 3, is parallel to the noted height direction, not transverse thereto as required by claim 7. Consideration and allowance of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Goto et al. '545. Claim 8 requires the noted trough (62), and providing urethane in such trough and molding the urethane to the ends (20, 22, 26, 28) of the sheet (18). Goto et al. '545 does not teach or suggest such trough nor the defined method. Consideration and allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, claim 9 defines a subcombination which is believed allowable.

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 and is believed allowable for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, amended claim 10 requires that the at least one injection port (86, 88) extend transversely to the defined height direction (38), in contrast to Goto et al. '545 at injection port 8 which is parallel to the noted height direction. Consideration and allowance of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance with claims 4, 6-10, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/721,974
Amendment dated December 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Michael E. Taken", with a horizontal line extending from the end.

Michael E. Taken
(Reg. No. 28,120)

100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 271-7590

Appl. No. 10/721,974
Amendment dated December 22, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 20, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet (3 of 3) includes a change to Fig. 7. This sheet replaces original sheet 3. Fig. 7 has been amended to change the reference character "56" to --57--, to correct a double reference character.

The Examiner's approval is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet